REMARKS

Claims 10-24 are pending in the present application, claims 18-24 having

been added herein. The Office Action and cited references have been considered. Favorable

reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The drawings were objected to for failing to show the memory controller, the

nonvolatile memory, and the internal volatile flag memory, and the relationship between

the elements. Applicant is submitting herewith a new figure 3 showing those elements, and

the relationship between them. The specification has been amended to provide an explicit

description. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added, because

the illustrated elements and the relationship between them, is supported by the

specification as originally filed. Approval of the new drawing is respectfully requested.

The claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as failing

to conform to U.S. practice. Applicant has amended the claims to overcome this rejection.

Applicant submits that these amendments do not affect the scope of the claims, and are not

intended to be, nor are they narrowing amendments. Withdrawal thereof is respectfully

requested.

Claims 10-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as being anticipated by

Larner et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,104,638). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the

following reasons.

Claim 10 has been rewritten to include one of the limitations previously

recited in claim 13. In particular, Claim 10 now recites a method for reconstructing

- 10 -

administrative data records relating to a nonvolatile memory that can be written in units of

sectors and erased in units of blocks, the administrative data records being stored in an

internal volatile flag memory of an assigned memory controller. The method comprising

the steps of setting up, in one or more memory blocks of the nonvolatile memory, a

contiguous reconstruction table for administrative memory data (RKT), continually

updating the reconstruction table in the nonvolatile memory with administrative data

records relating to all write and erase operations out of the internal volatile flag memory,

the step of continually updating comprising recording all information with which the

administrative data records of the internal volatile flag memory of the memory controller

can be completely reconstructed during a restart after a power failure, starting a

reconstruction when a predefined fill level of the reconstruction table (RKT) is reached, to

create a defined initial state of the administrative data records in the internal volatile flag

memory and in the reconstruction table (RKT), recording the start of the reconstruction as

a last entry (OE) in the reconstruction table, and recording a completion entry (FE) into the

reconstruction table, every time the reconstruction was successful. This is not taught,

disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record.

      The remarks submitted in the amendments filed on April 26, 2007,

November 7, 2007, and October 9, 2007, are incorporated by reference herein. In addition,

Applicant submits the following remarks.

      Larner describes a processor system with a RAM and a non-volatile memory,

which is arranged in individually erasable segments, also called blocks. The patent relates

to a method to synchronize the values of administrative data words (parameters) in the

RAM with previously updated data words which were continuously written to at least two

reserved segments of the non-volatile memory. At the beginning of a segment, a special ID

with a counter value is written, and the end of the relevant data entries is found by an entry

that has the value of an erased memory location. The synchronizing is done by reading all

relevant entries and overwriting the corresponding memory location in the RAM until an

empty (erased) entry is found. As the first segment is filled up, the second segment is filled

with current data words from RAM and the first segment is erased and filled with the value

FFFFhex. The next updating is done in the second segment until this is filled up again.

Then the segments are swapped again.

Applicant's application also relates to a method to update memory locations

in RAM from a reconstruction table in the non-volatile memory. One difference between

the claimed invention and Larner lies in the method for the reconstruction of the table and

which types of entries for which the method is utilized. According to Applicant's invention,

the reconstruction table has a fixed length and is optimized for memory administration

data. On page 12, the Office notes that claim 10 does not recite that the reconstruction

table is fixed length and is optimized for memory administration. Applicant agrees, and

asserts that the argument previously presented was made without deceptive intent, but

was merely made to explain the invention with respect to all of the claims, not just the

independent claims. The feature of the fixed length table was meant to refer to the

recitation of claim 11 that "every entry in the reconstruction table (RKT) is one sector or

one sector segment long", which depends from claim 10. As for the optimization, this is

inferentially claimed in claim 10 since claim 10 recites that the method includes "setting

up,... a contiguous reconstruction table for administrative memory data (RKT)." Applicant

regrets these misunderstandings. Applicant has added new claim 18 that includes these

two features specifically recited therein.

Further, according to the present invention, there are tables holding the

relation between logical and physical addresses and the addresses of alternate sectors, to

which data is written until a sector is filled. These tables of memory administration data

can be brought into a defined state that corresponds to the state used at the initial start of

the memory system. As mentioned in the previous response, when the entries fill up the

reconstruction table, a reorganization is started which brings the memory administration

data into the defined state. This start is marked with a special start-entry (OE). The Office

asserts on page 12 that the reorganization feature argued here is not recited in claim 10.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 10 recites "starting a reconstruction when a

predefined fill level . . . is reached . . . [and] recording the start of the reconstruction as a last

entry (OE). . . ." One of ordinary skill would understand that this argument concerning

reorganization refers to the claimed start of a reconstruction.

As also mentioned in the previous response, the end of the reorganization

process is also marked with a special end-entry (FE). If the end-entry (FE) is encountered,

all entries before that are no longer relevant. Page 12 of the Office Action also asserts that

the end-entry is not recited in claim 10. Applicant agrees, and again asserts that the

argument previously presented was made without deceptive intent, but was merely made

to explain the invention with respect to all of the claims, not just the independent claims. However, Applicant has amended claim 10 to include recording a completion entry (FE), *i.e.*, the end-entry.

In Larner, there is no reorganization process to bring the administrative data into a defined initial state. Larner only describes a reconstruction process to synchronize the values in the RAM and in the reconstruction table to the same current values. The administrative data of Larner do not have a defined initial state. They tend to become larger and larger. The claimed invention anticipates initial states of the data, such as initial values in allocation tables for memory addresses. The reorganization process brings the data into defined initial states which correspond to a new memory. Such a reorganization is marked with special entries in the reconstruction table. This is different than the end-of-table (FFFFhex). Both methods have such an end-of-table value behind the last written entry. Larner does not use a reorganization (reconstruction) and so there is no start-of reorganization marker (OE). Claim 10 also includes recording a completion marker for the successful reorganization (FE). Both markers are not taught or suggest in Larner.

According to the present claimed invention, the reorganization of the reconstruction table is not done by reading the actual values of the parameters from RAM. The reorganization is done by bringing the administrative memory data into an initial state and marking this process in the reconstruction table with the different entries FE and OE. This reorganization is not anticipated by Larner, as Larner teaches only an end-of-table-

marker (FFFFhex) and a counter at the beginning of the table, which is not sufficient for the reorganization process.

In view of these differences, Applicant respectfully submits that Larner does not disclose Applicant's claimed invention arranged as in claim 10. Applicant further submits that claims 11-17 are patentable at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 10.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that the arguments based on the lack of reorganization in the prior art do not have basis in the claims. Without conceding the merits of this assertion, Applicant has added new claims 18-24, which specifically recite a reorganization step (instead of the term "reconstruction" of claims 10-17). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 18-24 are patentable for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 10-17.

In the view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 10-24 are patentable over the prior art of record. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections of record. Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance and early notice to this effect is most earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at 202-628-5197.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By   /Ronni S. Jillions/
       Ronni S. Jillions
       Registration No. 31,979

RSJ:me
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\B\Back\BAUMHOF1\PTO\2008-05-13AmendmentBAUMHOF1.doc